

REMARKS

Claims 11, 13-15 and 23-25 are pending. By this response, claims 2-6, 8 and 9 are canceled, claims 11, 13 and 23 amended and claims 24 and 25 are added. Reconsideration and allowance based on the above amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 13, 14 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Teichman, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,145,648); claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Teichman in view of Davis, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,976,306) and claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Teichman in view of Nowicki (U.S. Patent No. 3,762,213). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Teichman provides a system that transports workpieces along a conveyor allowing the workpieces to be continuously transported while also allowing one or more workpieces to be processed, if necessary. In Teichman's system, a printed circuit board (PCB) is extracted by loader 11 and transported by the loader to conveyor belt 19 of feeder 21. Rollers 17 and 18 transport the conveyor belt to feed the PCB's toward an inspection system 14. The loader is returned to its initial loading position to extract each PCB for inspection.

In contrast, embodiments of the present invention provide an optical platform on which one or more inspection stations are located. The inspection station includes optical device interfaces for performing measurements and inspections on optical devices. The optical devices are attached to an optical

module. The optical module is mounted on an optical module carrier which is movable. The optical module carrier is moved to desired inspection station where the optical device is then aligned with the optical device interface.

Independent claims 11, 13 and 23 each recite, *inter alia*, the optical device interface located at a fixed first distance above the top surface of the optical platform and the optical module carrier position said optical device at a second distance above the optical platform corresponding to the fixed first distance, such that said optical device is aligned with said optical device interface for performing an inspection of said optical device.

The Office Action alleges that the first and second distances recited in applicant's claims are taught at column 3, lines 47 through 49 of Teichman. However, this section merely describes the raising of the printed circuit board from the conveyor belt onto a carriage. Nowhere is it taught or suggested within Teichman of corresponding the first and second distances such that an alignment of an optical device with an optical device interface is achieved allowing inspection of the device.

Further, claim 23 also recites obtaining the location, on an optical platform, of an inspection station and obtaining the coordinates of an optical device interface attached to the inspection station...positioning the optical device, based on the obtained coordinates, at a second distance above the optical platform corresponding to the fixed first distance. Also, dependent claims 24 and 25 each

recite the location of the optical device interface being precisely defined on the optical platform by pre-measured coordinates.

Teichman fails to teach or suggest utilizing coordinate values measured for each optical device interface thus allowing precise alignment of the optical device with the optical device interface during an inspection. In fact, utilizing coordinate values as claimed by applicants would be unnecessary in the system of Teichman since the conveyor transports the printed circuit boards past the inspection device and does not require precision alignment of the device with the inspection device. Further, Davis and Nowicki fail to make up for the deficiencies in Teichman.

In view of the above, applicants respectfully submit that Teichman alone or in combination with the Davis or Nowicki fails to teach each and every feature of the claimed invention as required. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 11, 13-15 and 23-25 are distinguishable over the art of record. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chad J. Billings (Reg. No. 48,917) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to

conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 
Michael R. Cammarata, #39,491

MRC/CJB:cb
4450-0345P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

Attachment(s)